UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,530	09/10/2001	Paula S. Newman	D/A1187Q	8646

7590   11/29/2004

Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/954,530	NEWMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
> THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
>   after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
>   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
>   earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*10 September 2001*</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*10 September 2001*</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications. Application filed 09/10/01.

2.   Claims 1-33 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 32, and 33 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liechti,**

'The SGF Metadata Framework', 1999 in view of Lyness, USPN 6,496,842 filed 5/28/1999.

In reference to independent claim 1, Liechti teaches:

There are different reasons for creating a graphical representation of a Web space. The

first is to support user navigation (compare to *"input means for receiving user input"*). See

Liechti, page 7. As presently claimed, the reference suggests user navigation, which, in turn, is

based upon the retrieval of user input.

Describing the structure of a site in Structured Graph Format (SGF) translates into

transforming a directed graph into a structured graph. The source graph is defined by a set of

nodes and a set of links. In the resulting structured graph, the set of nodes remains the same, but

the set of links is split into two disjoint subsets of hierarchical and associative links (compare to

"generating display specifications for producing an image of the tree structured information

when received by a display processor"). See Liechti, page 4.

A two-dimensional row and column arrangement of cell is illustrated in Figure 5 and

Figure 6, on page 11. The cells represent nodes and a hierarchical structure within a display area

(compare to "*each node is associated with a cell, said arrangement having a number of rows*

equal to the number of nodes in the longest path"). See Liechti, page 11.

The reference describes a hierarchy of nodes within a user interface and illustrates

various nodes in different positions (See Figure 12); however, Liechti does not explicitly state a

root node associated cell placed in a first row as well as leaf nodes. Lyness teaches an allocation

of display area to a portion of the sample hierarchy, arranged in the horizontal direction

(compare to "*a root node associated cell placed in a first row*"). Furthermore, Lyness discloses

node associated cells along a path fro the root node to a leaf in both a horizontal and vertical

display. See Lyness; figure 1-3. Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest

reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the various display methods taught by

Lyness combined with the hierarchical node development and node structure provide a

reasonable interpretation of the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, having the teachings of Liechti and Lyness before him/her at the time the

invention was made, to modify the hierarchical nodal methods of display to include the various

node views of Lyness, because it would have provided the user an easier way to explore and

understand the nodal hierarchies as well as an easy way to manipulate the hierarchies.

Liechti illustrates in Figure 5, on page 11, a hierarchy of nodes and associated nodes

representing user activity (compare to "*each column represents a path from the root to a leaf*").

See Liechti, figure 5.

Any node disclosed in Figure 5, on page 11, suggests a similar selection element. Figure

6, on page 11, illustrates an SGViewer node selected in the left side window, and highlighted in

other synchronized windows. This allows the user access to both detailed and contextual

information about the site structure.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Liechti teaches:

There are different reasons for creating a graphical representation of a Web space. The

first is to support user navigation. See Liechti, page 7.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Liechti teaches:

Our visualization tool, SGViewer, is however, using an original focus+context technique.

SGViewer visually represents the hierarchical and associative relationships specified in metadata

in two distinct panes. See Liechti, page 9.

In reference to dependent claim 4 & 5, Liechti teaches:

Animated transitions are operated when the user, starting from a global overview of the

structure, successively zooms in and out to get more detailed information. The reference does not

provide instruction as to what specific column or subtree is being added to the focus; however,

the reference provides the suggestion of utilizing a focus technique to get detailed information

while maintaining some context. See Liechti, page 9 & 10.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Liechti teaches:

Animated transitions are operated when the user, starting from a global overview of the

structure, successively zooms in and out to get more detailed information. See Liechti, page 10.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Liechti teaches:

The color of the nodes can be modified to indicate the current traffic: dark nodes are visited by many users, while light ones are only visited by a few. The color of nodes is only one graphical attribute that can be modified to annotate a diagram generated by SGViewer.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Liechti teaches:

The color of the nodes is only one graphical attribute that can be modified to annotate a diagram generated by SGViewer. Some others are described in Figure 12, making use both of the nodes inside, border, and width. See Liechti, page 24.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Liechti teaches:

Animated transitions are operated when the user, starting from a global overview of the structure, successively zooms in and out to get more detailed information. See Liechti, page 10.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Liechti teaches:

In the resulting structured graph, the set of nodes remains the same, but the set of links is split into two disjoint subsets of hierarchical links. See Liechti, page 4.

In reference to dependent claim 11 and 12, Liechti teaches:

Figure 7, on page 12, illustrates keywords entered by the user. The reference further illustrates search results displayed in two different panes, which suggests two different views of the selection based upon a user input.

In reference to dependent claim 13 and 14, Liechti teaches:

Figure 7, on page 12, illustrates keywords entered by the user. The reference further illustrates search results displayed in two different panes, which suggests two different views of the selection based upon a user input.

In reference to dependent claim 15, Liechti teaches:

Figure 5 illustrates a selection among the various nodes and various columns of the

display. Selection of nodes provides access to the hierarchy of document nodes.

In reference to dependent claim 16, Liechti teaches:

Figure 5 illustrates a selection among the various nodes and various columns of the

display. Selection of nodes provides access to the hierarchy of document nodes.

In reference to dependent claim 17, Liechti teaches:

The SGViewer node has been selected in the hierarchy and appears in the center of the

network. The reference provides a sufficient suggestion of a subtree selection and the computing

means further generating a display specification such that only the SGViewer selected is

displayed among the other nodes.

In reference to dependent claim 18, Liechti teaches:

The modification of the border and width of nodes is possible based on the user

navigation. Furthermore, when visitors are detected on the site, notifications are sent to

SGMonitor and the diagram is accordingly updated.

In reference to dependent clam 19 and 20, Liechti teaches:

The adjustment of the border and width of nodes is possible based on the user

navigation. Furthermore, when visitors are detected on the site, notifications are sent to

SGMonitor and the diagram is accordingly updated.

In reference to dependent claim 21, Liechti teaches:

The 'SGF Home Page', illustrated in Figure 6 demonstrates a reading selection (as

presently claimed). The SGViewer node, selected in the left-side window, is highlighted in other

synchronized windows. This allows a user to retrieve both detailed and contextual information about the site structure. See Liechti, Figure 6.

In reference to dependent claim 22, Liechti teaches:

A site hierarchy within the presentation means for allowing users the ability to select regions within the site and for applying operations on them. See Liechti, Figure 6.

In reference to dependent claim 23, Liechti teaches:

Animated transitions are operated when the user, starting from a global overview of the structure, successively zooms in and out to get more detailed information. See Liechti, page 10.

In reference to dependent claim 24, Liechti teaches:

Figure 5 illustrates the essential content necessary for comprehension of the reading selection, which in this case could be the SGF Home Page. The elements below the SGF Home Page consists of 'What's New', 'Publication', 'What is SGF', etc. The content disclosed in Liechti provides a suggestion of the limitations within the claim (as presently claimed). See Liechti, Figure 5.

In reference to dependent claim 25, Liechti teaches:

The sections of the SGF Home Page, which suggest similar column sections that provide a way for a user to read various sections within the home page is a proficient example of a reading section, as presently claimed. See Liechti, Figure 5.

In reference to dependent claim 26 and 27, Liechti teaches:

Animated transitions are operated when the user, starting from a global overview of the structure, successively zooms in and out to get more detailed information. The reference does not provide instruction as to what specific column or subtree is being added to the focus; however,

the reference provides the suggestion of utilizing a focus technique to get detailed information

while maintaining some context. See Liechti, page 9 & 10.

In reference to dependent claim 28, Liechti teaches:

In reference to claims 28-33, the claims reflect the methods comprising similar instructions

used for performing the display methods as claimed in numbers 1-7, and in further view of the

following, are rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Mariani et al.,   USPN 6,650,348   filed (1/17/01)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is (571) 272-4127.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
November 4, 2004

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER